



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/612,669	07/02/2003	Edmond P. Guillot	042049/265218	3468

826 7590 04/22/2005

ALSTON & BIRD LLP
BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA
101 SOUTH TRYON STREET, SUITE 4000
CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000

EXAMINER

OMGBA, ESSAMA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3726

DATE MAILED: 04/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

①

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/612,669	Applicant(s) GUILLOT, EDMOND P.	
	Examiner Essama Omgba	Art Unit 3726	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on April 4, 2005 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Meyers et al. (US Patent 3,669,498).

With regards to claim 14, Meyers et al. discloses a method of forming a rail clip 62 for anchoring a plurality of wire springs 32 in a seat base wherein a plurality of tabs 64 spaced apart along a longitudinal edge of an elongate rail 62 are upstruck out of the elongate rail 62, the tabs being formed into hooks and configured to receive and firmly hold ends of wire springs, see column 2, lines 66-70. Applicant should note that the edge opposite the one with the tabs could be considered a securing portion. Regarding

Art Unit: 3726

the recitation the "rail "having a securing portion for securing the rail to the wooden seat base", Applicant should note that a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 370 F.2d 576, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 312 F.2d 937, 939, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

For claims 15 and 16, Applicant should note that the cross-sectional shape of the elongate rail or the process of obtaining the cross-sectional shape lends no patentable weight to the method being claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyers et al.

Meyers et al. discloses a method of forming a rail clip as shown above except for holes being formed in the rail for fasteners to pass through. However it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that forming

Art Unit: 3726

holes in the rail for fasteners to pass through is an obvious matter of design choice wherein no stated problem is solved or unexpected results obtained in forming holes in the rail for fasteners to pass through versus welding the rail to the frame for example. Furthermore it is within the general knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art to appropriately fasten the rail clip to the frame.

6. Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyers et al. in view of Bechtoldt et al. (US Patent 5,542,775).

Meyers et al. discloses a method of forming a rail clip as shown above except for applying noise-suppressing material to spring-engaging surfaces of each of the hooks. However Bechtoldt et al. teaches a spring holding hook 18 provided with a plastic liner in order to avoid squeaking, see column 1, lines 31-49 and column 3, lines 49-52. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have provided noise-suppressing material to spring engaging surfaces of each of the hooks of Meyers et al., in light of the teachings of Bechtoldt et al., in order to avoid squeaking.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed April 4, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to Applicant's argument that there is no disclosure or suggestions by Meyers that the frame supporting the upstruck tabs could be latter attached to another separate frame, the examiner submits that a recitation of the intended use of the

Art Unit: 3726

claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 370 F.2d 576, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 312 F.2d 937, 939, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). In the instant application, the claims are drawn to a method of forming rail clips on a rail wherein tabs are upstruck from a rail. The intended use of the rail lends no patentable weight to the method being claimed. Furthermore Meyers' frame could be attached to another structure such as the body frame of a vehicle by welding or other fastening means.

In view of the above remarks, the examiner maintains that the instant invention is anticipated as it relates to claims 14-16 and that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established as it relates to claims 17-19.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Essama Omgba whose telephone number is (571) 272-4532. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (10-7:30) First Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Vo can be reached on (571) 272-4690. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3726

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Essama Omgba
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3726

eo
April 18, 2005